

BH

Dear Jim,

5/22/84

Lynch's brief came, I've read it and written him, copy enclosed. I'm also sending a copy to Hitchcock, without any note or letter. I've not received a copy of his brief for you, which I guess is a kind of "distancing." At first I decided to send him a copy as a courtesy but I also believe that at some point the fact that under oath and in the case record I did provide exactly the kind of information pretendedly sought under discovery may be something he'd want to know. Maybe use.

In today's mail is the marked-up copy of my 4/19/84 to you regarding the copies of records from Hoover's O & C you'd sent. On page 2 you ask for the identification of the reporter friend to whom the FBI leaked what it wanted to leak of CD 1. I'm sure he expects me to keep that confidential, as I have for years and as I think I should continue to do. However, if you have some reason, perhaps I can help you. I mean substantial reason, more than curiosity.

When it is by no means complete, I do have a file on FBI leaks and perhaps a subfile on leaks of CD 1.

There were at least two DeLoachers doing that leaking, Bishop and another whose name I've forgotten. I might recall if I saw it.

While I do not know what is and is not appropriate in any reply brief, I do believe it may be important to include the fact that those affidavits do contain exactly the kind of information the FBI claimed to need. I am reasonably confident that this was not an oversight on Lynch's part, although it may have been, and I do not make an issue of the omission if deliberate. But if it becomes relevant, I think there is a vast difference between what I included in appeals, which the FBI and its counsel may claim they did not know about, and what is unchallenged in the case record. If it is in the case record and the court knows that, its reaction might be different and more favorable to us. Then there is no excuse and the harassment becomes quite clear.

It is on the chance that this omission was because he wanted to omit it that I did not include in the specifics in the affidavits what I did to the N.O. and DL attestations regarding the searches and Ferrie in particular. But I do think they, too, are significant. If you have any input. A few pointed illustrations may have impact at oral argument.

If you have any ideas about what I might want to give him copies of to have on hand, please let me know. I think it would be well to be prepared for any Smithy on the panel who may refer to the spectro case. This is why when we spoke recently I again asked you to try to locate those records I sent you when I found them on my desk. They include the FBI's copy of my original request, which is specific in requesting the testing on the clothing, the FBI's correct understanding of my amended request and what it included, etc.

In the cited memo I see that I quote M.A. Jones as saying that the FBI had remained "meticulously silent." In fact contemporaneous they were trying to pin their own leaking on the Department, as I now recall on Guthman in particular. I do not recall whether those records are in the subject file I made but I do remember them well enough.

The student who did the Marina treatment study got an A.

Lila Analero was here yesterday. She asked for you. She looks well, is more mature, and is considering going for a doctorate beginning this fall.

Best,



who?

third shots hit JFK and the second hit Connally. The rest of this graf is not correct and does not come from any disclosed record. The last graf reinforces this explanation of the shots. Also graf 5 on page 4.

Document 436, DeLoach to Mohr, 4/24/64, page 2 graf 1: DeLoach protests unnamed "Department official," who is Katzenbach, then acting AG, who told the Commission "that the FBI was 'leaking' information. I told Manchester that this allegation had of course been false." Actually, it was under DeLoach himself that the info was leaked, including to a reporter friend of mine. These contents of the FBI report, CD 1, that it wanted out, started being leaked for appearance on 12/2/63, with the major stories 12/5/63. As Katzenbach told the Commission in executive session 12/5, "nobody but the FBI could have done the leaking. (Ford was DeLoach's informant on the Commission.) At least some of this particular leaking was by Tom Bishop, who was directly under DeLoach.

"Oswald was a non-violent type of person," page 2, graf 3. How much more non-violent can one be when one hand-delivers to the FBI a letter threatening to blow its Dallas office up, which FBIHQ did know, according to the Inspector General's investigation of it after this was leaked in Dallas in 1975.

Although ^{Hoover} added three notes stating he would not see Manchester, he did and he blabbed a bit, boasted a bit, it was disclosed, and I have a copy in the Manchester subject file.

The record filing of this copy was eliminated in xeroxing to eliminate the right margin, where that is always noted. This copy is from 94-37374, which appears to be on Manchester, the book or both.

Document 453 does not have the main record copy file eliminated in xeroxing. This copy also is from the 94-37374 file. The original is in 62-111371 as Serial 10. I have a note on that file indicating that it includes 62-109060-3417 as a NR copy, of a memo on Manchester's meeting with Hoover, re this book. A copy was designated for ~~the~~ a different 94 file, Xed out. Hoover's response, Document 454, also NR in 94-37374, apparently is # 8 in 62-111371. In the course of checking my incomplete file of FBI file numbers to see if I have a record of 94-45162, which the Xed out number may be, I learned that I do not but that there ~~is~~ is still another 94 file that holds records relating to this matter, 94-48768, which is a recorded copy of a memo that is Not Recorded in the main assassination file, 62-109060, after Serial 3325. All these files for one author, one book, one meeting with JEH? Document 455, original # 7 in 62-111371, had a copy designated for another file, number illegible. In this one another of DeLoach's leakers, stated (in graf 3) that rather than leaking "we have remained meticulously silent." This memo summarizes their contacts with Manchester and concludes with its "cordial" nature since he wrote what the FBI liked in 1955. Hoover then noted, "I will see him" and states the time. Document 456 is #6 in the 62-111371 file and also originally was designated for the file the number of which is illegible. Although Lesar did not provide a copy of the DeLoach memo reporting what was said at the meeting with Manchester, I assume a copy of it also is in the O & C file. My subject-file copy is from a main assassination file, I think 62-109060.

M.A. Jones

I think it is a fair inference that although previously strong in his refusal to see Manchester, Hoover changed his mind on learning that in 1955 Manchester gave wide distribution to a Hoover article.